DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 786 UD 025 269

AUTHOR Foley, Eileen; Oxley, Diana
TITLE Effective Dropout Prevention: An Analysis of the 1985-86 Program in New York City. Report No. 3, Dropout Prevention Series.
INSTITUTION Public Education Association, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 77p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; Dropout Research; *Dropouts; *Educational Improvement; High Schools; *Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The State-funded Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention program and the City-funded Dropout Prevention Program distributed over $30 million to the New York City Board of Education in 1985-86. This document is a summary report of an analysis of program implementation in the schools receiving these funds aimed at better understanding of political and organizational requirements for successful implementation. Findings show that policymakers must further consider the realities of the local context when designing program guidelines. Another goal of the analysis was to discern the strengths and weaknesses of the various programs. This involved examination of types of services offered, of school versus community-based organization delivery of these services, and of the larger school context of programs being studied. Findings document that continued program development and general school improvement are needed for dropout prevention. After describing program models, the report provides policy recommendations in the following areas: (1) targeting; (2) implementation; and (3) program development. Findings are presented in the following general sections: (1) implementation; (2) staff evaluations of programs; (3) student satisfaction; and (4) dropout prevention and school environment. An appendix provides sampling and interview methods as well as interview forms. (LHW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED277786

EFFECTIVE DROPOUT PREVENTION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1985-86 PROGRAM IN NEW YORK CITY

Examination of Different Program Models and Their Components, With PEA's Directions for Overcoming Obstacles to Success

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Eileen Foley
Public Ed. Assn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A report of the
PUBLIC EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
by Eileen Foley, Project Director
and Diana Oxley, Ph.D.

UD025269

EFFECTIVE DROPOUT PREVENTION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1985-86

PROGRAM IN NEW YORK CITY

Report No.3. Dropout Prevention Series

November 1986

This work was supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation

Public Education Association

39 West 32nd Street

New York, New York 10001

Project Staff

Eileen Foley, Project Director

Diana Oxley, Ph.D., Research Associate

Interviewers

Sema Brainin, Ph.D.

Rosemary Durant-Giles, MSW

Yolanda Mallette

Diana Oxley, Ph.D.

Constancia Warren, Ph.D.

Foundation Project Officer

Diane August, Ph.D., Carnegie Corporation

PREFACE

This is the summary report of the Public Education Association regarding the implementation of New York City's 1985-86 Attendance Improvement/ Dropout Prevention Program (AI/DP) and the 1985-86 Dropout Prevention (DPP). Previous to this report, based on preliminary implementation data, papers were prepared for the state legislature and city policymakers. This document includes some of the earlier material but greatly expands on those observations and insights and updates the recommendations in light of current opportunities for program improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements. iii

Introduction. 1

Chapter 1
Design of AIDP and DPP Program Models. 3

Chapter 2
Highlights of Findings 6

Chapter 3
Policy Recommendations 8

Chapter 4
Findings 13

I. Program Implementation 13
A. Level of Program - Implementation 13
1. Personnel. 13
2. Service Provision. 15

B. Obstacles to Program Implementation. 15
1. Problems with Program Management 15
2. Problems with Program Elements 16

II. Staff Evaluations of the Program 17
A. Satisfaction with Program Governance 17
1. Program Input. 18
2. Monitoring Procedures. 18

B. Evaluation of Program Staff. 20
C. Evaluation of CBO Component. 20
D. Satisfaction with Student Eligibility Criteria 21
E. Satisfaction with Program Design 22
1. SOAR/Strategies High Schools 22
2. DPP High Schools 25
3. AIDP Middle Schools. 26
4. DPP Middle Schools 26
5. Summary. 27

F. Satisfaction with Program Funding. 27
G. Job Satisfaction 28
H. Appraisal of Program Impact. 29

III. Student Satisfaction 32
A. Satisfaction with Program. 32
B. Program Impact 34

IV. Dropout Prevention and School Environment. 34
A. School Size. 35
B. Proposition of Academically Able Students. . . . 35

Appendix A
Study Sample and Procedures 36
Appendix B
Interview Forms 38

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the 1985-86 school year, New York City schools were besieged by as many as eight teams of evaluators from government, policy, and research organizations seeking information about the schools' dropout prevention programs. PEA was one such group. We are very grateful to Nathan Quinones, the Chancellor of the New York City School System, and the schools' principals and staffs for the opportunity to learn from their efforts how better to serve the city's school children. It would please us enormously to thank all our respondents publicly, but given the confidential nature of our interviews we will content ourselves with a general statement of gratitude.

Our research team included five interviewers who visited the schools -- Diana Oxley, Ph.D., Constancia Warren, Ph.D., Sema Brainin, Ph.D., Rosemary Durant-Giles, M.S.W., and Yolanda Mallette -- and several coders who organized the data -- Dorothy Calo, Alan Convis, Marilyn Cohen, and Randi Goldstein. We appreciate enormously the diligence and professionalism they brought to this effort.

Many individuals read and commented on the initial drafts of this report. We want particularly to thank Jeanne Silver Frankl, the Executive Director of the Public Education Association, who as always set the standards for our work, and steered the course through obstacles which threatened to keep us from meeting those standards.

The Carnegie Corporation generously funded this investigation, and we thank Diane August, Ph.D., our program Officer, for her confidence and support.

The authors, of course, remain responsible for the accuracy of the facts and the interpretation provided.

EFFECTIVE DROPOUT PREVENTION
AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1985-86
PROGRAM IN NEW YORK CITY

Introduction

The 1985-86 school year was animated by the Board of Education's continued efforts to reduce the large numbers of students leaving school without a diploma. For this undertaking, the state-funded Attendance Improvement/ Dropout Prevention program (AI/DP) and the city-funded Dropout Prevention Program (DPP) distributed more than $30 million to over 130 needy schools.

With support from the Carnegie Corporation, the Public Education Association undertook an analysis of the implementation of programs in schools receiving funds under the 1985-86 AI/DP-DPP allocations, marking the second year of research and advocacy carried out by PEA on these programs.

The major goal of the 1985-86 analysis was to understand better the political and organizational requirements for successful implementation of AI/DP and DPP programs. It became clear during the 1984-85 year of program monitoring that untimely implementation of programs posed as great an obstacle to dropout prevention efforts as inadequate knowledge about what to do.

Through the 1984-85 study we learned that local commitment/ownership of programs played a crucial positive role in successful implementation and that program features, particularly organizational complexity, played a deterrent role. The findings we present here reinforce these views; they point out that policymakers must further consider the realities of the local context when designing program guidelines.

Our second goal in this analysis was to discern the strengths and weaknesses of the various programs. Since many different types of programs were being tested, we wanted to examine their practices and begin to draw conclusions about the merits of each in order to influence the direction in which they evolved. We were interested in the types of services offered, and school versus community based organization (CBO) delivery of these services. In addition, we wished to look beyond the programs to the larger school context in which they operated to learn more about characteristics of the school that might complicate program efforts. The following pages document our conviction that continued program development and general school improvement are needed to realize dropout prevention.

Organization of the report. The contents of this report are arranged in the following way: In Chapter 1, the dropout prevention program models which were formulated under the AIDP-DPP initiatives and examined in the present study are described. In Chapter 2, the major findings of our study are highlighted. Chapter 3 contains PEA's recommendations for Board of Education policy on dropout prevention. The recommendations address three important aspects of the dropout prevention undertaking: the student target population, program implementation requirements, and desirable directions for program development. In Chapter 4, the study findings in their entirety are presented. Educators are strongly urged to review this section to gain a better understanding of the problems and achievements that characterize current dropout prevention efforts. A description of our sampling and interview methods are presented in Appendix A; Appendix B contains the principal, staff and student interview instruments.

Chapter 1

Design of AI/DP and DPP Programs

The dropout prevention program models which have been adopted by New York City public schools are described below. We examined examples of each of these in the present study. See Appendix A for a full description of the sample programs we used.

Each AI/DP and DPP site, as detailed in the Chancellor's Preliminary Report on AI/DP and DPP, was required to provide six program components. These components -- some of which could be provided through funding sources other than AI/DP and DPP -- were as follows:

(a) A teacher serving as a site facilitator, who is freed from home room assignment and two other periods per day. The facilitator identifies and tracks the progress of targeted students, coordinates all program activities, and facilitates the activities of a pupil personnel committee, which recommends and follows up on a comprehensive framework of services for each eligible student.

(b) A program of attendance outreach, to follow up on the absence of targeted students through parental awareness. This program operates in addition to mandated daily attendance activities.

(c) Appropriate guidance and counseling services available to every targeted student, in order to identify and address individual problems that may contribute to poor attendance.

(d) A health services program, consisting of diagnostic screening of students in physical, psychological, and educational areas, referral for appropriate follow-up services, and assurance that needed services are provided.

(e) A school-level linkage program to address the problems of students who make the transition from one level of schooling to the next. This includes the development of relationships between the staffs and students at middle schools and at high schools.

(f) A high-interest alternative education program which incorporates basic skills instruction and individualized attention in order to encourage better attendance and improve achievement.

Schools were encouraged to contract with community-based organizations (CBOs) for some of the components of their programs.

The Dropout Prevention Program (DPP), under the jurisdiction of Victor Herbert, Superintendent for Dropout Prevention, operated in 10 high

schools and 29 middle schools feeding into those high schools. The purpose of the DPP high school level intervention was to try out new approaches to dropout prevention in a "laboratory" mode within the scope of the six mandated components. The new approaches included: the redesign of major features of the educational program, the greater utilization of services provided by community-based organizations and the creation of incentives for students to attend school.

Laboratory schools had the opportunity to design their programs at a two-week summer institute for planning and staff development. Staff members met to design approaches to the six mandated components, including plans for the utilization of funds for increased building security, increased OTPS ("other than personal services") and an automated attendance system.

These in-house program development efforts ultimately produced quite diverse plans that included the reorganization of an entire school around interest clusters for 9th and 10th graders, a mini school for at-risk students, a job program for over-age students with a major corporation in which remedial teaching in the morning was linked with employment in the afternoon, and using seniors as mentors in freshman classes. Since there was clear intention in the DPP initiative to compare a school-based delivery model to a CBO-based delivery model, most of the ten schools ultimately subcontracted with one or more CBO, for the provision of guidance or family services. In all 14 CBOs participated.

The DPP program at the middle school level followed the six mandated components more literally than the high school program. There was no summer workshop, no special security, no additional OTPS, nor funds for overall school improvement. For purposes of understanding the relative utility of a CBO-based versus a school-based model, 15 of the middle schools subcontracted with CBOs; the rest employed school personnel to deliver services.

The AI/DP program was active in 26 high schools and 68 middle schools. Sixteen AI/DP high schools implemented a modified mini-school program for truants called SOAR (Student Opportunity, Advancement, and Retention). SOAR organizes groups of 20 students for block programming in interdisciplinary classes which meet for double periods. Credit is based on mastery of material and numbers of hours attended. A daily tutorial is provided by the program teachers, and a guidance counselor is attached to the program for supportive counseling. Seven additional high schools developed a program called "Strategies" based on SOAR. Three of the 26 AI/DP high schools took a case management approach and contracted with the Federation Employment and Guidance Services (FEGS), a CBO, for the provision of support services to truants. FEGS services include counselling, work experience, skill training and family support. Their program is called Operation Success.

While the AI/DP emphasis at the high school level was, for the most part, on restructuring classroom learning, the AI/DP program at the middle

school level incorporated external supportive activities whose aim was to help youngsters cope more effectively in the standard classroom. The latter provided attendance monitoring, support services and incentives to at-risk students in strict compliance with the six mandated components. It was identical to the DPP middle school except that in AIDP middle schools the services were provided by school personnel.

Each of the 97 middle school programs (AI/DP and DPP included) received $150,000 to serve 150 students in the 1985-86 school year. Students were eligible for service in these programs if they were absent 15 or more days in the spring of 1985, or 30 or more days in the 1984-85 school year.

Most of the AI/DP high schools served 150 students with funding averaging $200,000 per school. To be eligible students must have been absent at least 20 days in the spring of 1985 or at least 40 days in the entire 1984-85 school year.

Funding for DPP high school programs was variable based upon the size of the school and the extent of the need. It ranged from over $150,000 to nearly $800,000. DPP schools directed a portion of their resources to serve their entire ninth and tenth grades; most also included case management activities which targeted smaller populations. To be eligible for these services students must have been absent 25 or more days during the spring term or, for up to five percent of the program participants, more than 10 days in each of the first two months of the current year.

Chapter 2

Highlights of Findings

Implementation. High school programs organized around classroom interventions (SOAR and Strategies) were implemented in a timely way as were the systemic aspects of high school DPP programs. All middle school programs were delayed, and all CBO-delivered services in the high schools and middle schools were delayed.

Implementation, it seems, was enhanced when programs were either highly compatible with school organization, that is, built around the classroom as in SOAR or when the schools were given a great deal of discretion (ownership) and some planning time as in the school based aspect of the high school DPP program.

The most poorly implemented programs were middle schools programs where the design of the initiative (provision of multiple support services) required the collaboration of several staff, but no planning time was allocated to allow staff to integrate and orchestrate their activities.

The problem schools encountered in collaborating with community based organizations initiated with the Central Board of Education. This year as last year the Board of Education did not adequately facilitate the negotiation of CBO contracts.

Program design. Students reported that the strength of the high school mini-school program (SOAR and Strategies) was its ability to provide strong academic support. It had the disadvantage, however, of making students feel labeled and set apart from the mainstream of life in the school. Further, our observations suggest that few limited English proficient (LEP) students can take advantage of this program as there is no bilingual component. Another serious problem with SOAR was staff dissatisfaction. Instructional staff felt the students were extremely unmotivated and hard to teach. In addition, nearly all staff resented having little input into the overall design of their program.

The DPP high school program may have something to teach relative to student and staff complaints about SOAR. DPP high school students were very satisfied with the jobs-components of their programs, where they existed, and the case management component. The staffs' relatively high level of satisfaction with DPP was based in part on the fact that the funding of DPP high school programs was viewed as adequate whereas AI/DP funding was not. In addition, staff viewed the freedom to design their own program as a boon to their enterprise and a source of motivation.

On the deficit side, the DPP program, while often very attractive to the staff and participants, did not in most schools directly take on the critical task of improving students' performance in the classroom. DPP staff recognized that much more needed to be done to strengthen their programs' relationship to the classroom and academic learning.

Labeling played a negative role in middle school programs, as it did in SOAR. It was obvious that students in middle schools were receiving special help because they were often pulled out of class to see counselors, etc. Dissatisfaction was intensified at the middle school level, moreover, because the students felt not only that they were being labeled "retarded," but that they were also forced to miss needed instructional time. In addition, middle school staff, like SOAR staff, felt some resistance to working with youngsters they viewed as unmotivated.

Finally, common to all program models was the lack of a meaningful and successfully implemented strategy for involving the parents of students. No other program component was more consistently lacking than parent participation. It is clear that despite staff's general claim that families are more implicated in student failure than schools, no means of involving them in the solution of the dropout problem was found.

To summarize, staff members' evaluations of the design of their programs indicated that no single program model was complete. In effect, it appeared that every school that serves the at-risk could benefit from the combined strengths of a systemic approach, a case management approach, and a mini-school approach. In addition, all program models suffered from the lack of parent involvement.

This means that dropout prevention programs must have considerable depth and breadth, structure as well as flexibility. The key to success is both to motivate youngsters to come to school and to greatly enhance their chances of succeeding in the classroom. Some programs do pieces of this better than others. The DPP high school jobs-programs seem clearly to be the most motivating, but Project SOAR is far advanced in addressing the academic needs of youngsters. The most serious problems exist in the middle schools where youngsters are at times pulled out of class to receive services. Ultimately the search for effective program models is a search for organizational structures which can coherently weave together the matrix of interventions.

CBO service delivery. School personnel offered consistent support for the idea that CBO staff possess skills that both complement their own and enlarge the school's capacity to help at-risk youth. Limitations on the CBO's effectiveness included delays attributable to the process for awarding contracts at the middle school level (negotiations often took place between the District Superintendents and 110 Livingston Street and bypassed the schools' principals) as well as the Board's inability to process contracts in a manner which would permit the CBOs' timely introduction into the schools, and the CBOs' unfamiliarity with school procedures.

School-wide conditions. The difficulty of the task of dropout prevention is aggravated by several school-wide conditions. The immense size of schools, the large proportions of below-grade level students, and the bewildering array of academic programs which flow from these were cited by school staff as significant obstacles to dropout prevention. Ironically, the introduction of dropout prevention programs into the schools worsens these conditions. Furthermore, the glaring inadequacy of space for programs in school buildings was frequently identified as delaying implementation and slowing the rate of service delivery.

Chapter 3

Recommendations

The recommendations which follow relate the foregoing findings and conclusions to the key policy decisions facing the Board of Education. Some have already been acted upon or received a measure of formal acceptance, and where this is the case it is noted.

A. Targeting Decisions:

1. Continued Emphasis on the Most At-Risk Population

By choosing to serve youngsters who are dropout-prone, rather than those having incipient or transitional attendance problems, the school system has targeted a population which is at once needy, very expensive to serve (See Foley and Crull, 1986), and out of favor. Out of favor, because on some level, these youngsters are the least motivated of students. Despite, indeed because of, the resistance to working with the most difficult to educate, we recommended that they be the focus of attention in this program, and we are pleased policymakers maintained that focus in the 1986-87 school year. The goal of such a targeting decision is to establish the value that no youngster is expendable. All must be educated.

2. Ongoing Attention to Youngsters after Initial Year

Students in the AI/DP and DPP programs, experience suggests, will continue to need support after the program year. This is especially true for AI/DP and DPP students making the transition from middle school to high school. We applaud the fact that the Board of Education has enabled schools to design initiatives in the 1986-87 school year which respond to the continuing needs of students who are technically no longer eligible for services.

3. More Attention to Limited English Proficient Students

The relative success of SOAR makes it important that what appears to be unintentional discrimination against limited English proficient (LEP) students be overcome. LEP students tend to be discriminated against in mini-schools because the small scale of these interventions makes it very costly to serve students with special needs unless special arrangements are made in advance.

B. Implementation Requirements:

4. Increased Planning and More Local School Initiative in Middle Schools

The AI/DP program makes significant organizational demands on middle schools. To offset the disorganization and fragmentation troubling the

middle school program, increased school-wide planning is necessary. We believe a productive form is the summer institute for key school and community program planners. That approach worked well in the Mayor's 1985-86 dropout prevention program. The institute, led by the school principal, can develop and coordinate AI/DP with related school (especially PREP) and community-based efforts, and integrate their various lessons for dropout prevention. Such joint pre-planning increases staff ownership, reduces start-up delays that vitiate program dollars, and more than compensates for costs. It can also foster meaningful collaboration, not mere coexistence, between schools and the CBOs with which they work. The Board of Education's 1986-87 program guidelines, in response to our recommendation, permit districts and CBOs to use part of their allocations for summer planning. In the future we would like to see the planning process viewed as a necessity and resources especially earmarked.

Planning was one ingredient missing from the middle school initiative. The other was wise, involved local school decision making. The design of the program was narrowly fixed -- down to the percent of a staff member's time to be spent coordinating the program -- by Board of Education guidelines. The only major decision the local actors faced was what CBO to select, and that decision, of course, only pertained to DPP Middle Schools. Further, it was made at the district, not the school level, leaving the middle school principals decidedly disengaged. The Board of Education has accepted our recommendation that local school leaders exercise more discretion in program development. This is a good first step in the direction of establishing a better balance between the Central Board's understandable preoccupation with accountability and the imperative of local decision making.

5. On-going School-Based Staff Development for SOAR Teachers

The most frequently reported reason for delays in the school-based aspect of AIDP/DPP programs was the inability of the schools to find instructional staff interested in working with truants who, as a group, are viewed as unmotivated and extremely difficult to teach. The turnover rate in instructional staff projected by some SOAR teachers was above 50%. It is apparent that unless SOAR and other teachers are helped to develop the commitment and skills needed to reach truants, many will take more rewarding assignments.

We therefore recommend school-based staff development structures which will enable SOAR teachers to integrate the knowledge and experience of other school staff who have been working with at-risk students, for example, PREP teachers. Further, we advocate that school psychologists and guidance counselors be used more extensively to prepare teachers to deal with the social context presented by SOAR classrooms.

6. A Strong Initiative to Facilitate Contractual Agreements with CBOs.

Serious delays occurred in virtually all programs developed collaboratively between the schools and community-based organizations. This is the second year of serious service delays due to the contractual

procedures adhered to by the Board of Education. The system of assigning a CBO to an individual attorney responsible for facilitating the contract did not work. Furthermore, based upon preliminary assessments of the 1986-87 program, the decision to appoint a special administrator to oversee the process did not work adequately either. CBOs in the 1986-87 school year seem again to be the victim of delays and unwieldly procedures. We emphasize the importance of correcting these problems and call upon the new Board of Education to take whatever measures are necessary to institute procedures that will end them. The Board of Education clearly requires assistance from other city agencies (such as the Youth Bureau) that are experienced in subcontracting.

It is a good sign, despite continued disappointing results vis-a-vis the contract negotiations, that the Superintendent for Dropout Prevention is planning to engage staff from the Grand Street Settlement House to facilitate the assimilation of other CBOs less familiar with the schools.

7. Alleviation of Overcrowding in Target Schools

Most of the schools we visited were overcrowded. Both returning truants and new program staff members placed additional stress on the capacity of these buildings. The irony of dropout prevention efforts in this context is that schools have a powerful countervailing incentive not to accommodate additional individuals.

There are three alternative solutions to the crowding problem: hold down enrollment in AI/DP and DPP schools, architecturally or otherwise modify the use of existing space in these schools, or find additional room in a neighboring under-utilized facility. Each of the schools must be asked to project the costs and benefits of each of these approaches and in collaboration with the Board of Education, make an appropriate selection.

Despite the tradition of zoned schools accepting all students in their catchment area, we think the first solution has considerable merit. It is hard to reconcile the reality of today's large, overcrowded, urban school, serving a preponderance of underprepared students with the goal of quality education for all. This is particularly relevant to dropout prevention because underachievers, research indicates, are those most negatively affected by large schools and overcrowding. For this same reason, leasing space for mini-schools off school grounds has special merit.

This recommendation has unfortunately not yet resulted in a concrete plan by the Board of Education to ameliorate the problem.

C. Program Development:

8. Strengthen the Academic Component of DPP High School Programs

Many DPP programs evidenced the capacity to increase students' motivation to attend school via job programs and outreach, but few developed academic interventions with sufficient potency fundamentally to affect students' classroom performance. Interventions are needed that will enhance

students' rate of credit accumulation. Such strategies include (a) mini-schools, (b) transitional programs to enable youngsters who enter high school in the middle of the term to "catch up," (c) breaking semesters into shorter cycles which reduce the time between students' efforts and reward (credit), and (d) a system of of banking points toward credits, rather than a hit or miss/all or nothing approach toward credit accumulation.

9. Minimize Unnecessary Tracking in SOAR Program

SOAR's great strength is its forthright intention and capacity to improve the teaching/learning relationship. Implementation and student satisfaction data tend to favor this approach to the truant. The academic and emotional needs of youngsters are often so acute and the mainstream of our high schools so ill-structured relative to those needs that a special resource-rich environment set apart from the mainstream of the school seems to produce the most immediate benefit for the investment. The problem, of course, is that the SOAR students are isolated from some positive aspects of overall school life as well as the negative aspects, and they often feel labeled and inferior, and this works against the goals of the program. We recommend that SOAR programs be required to develop structures for mainstreaming students who could benefit from classes outside the SOAR track.

10. Increased Attention to Program Design in the Middle Schools

The failure to schedule services in middle schools in such a way that the "supports" did not interfere with the youngsters' instructional program was contrary to the goals of the program. If the standard organization of the middle schools is so inflexible that periods cannot be blocked for support services then services should be restricted to before or after school, or mini-schools like SOAR should be designed to facilitate reorganization. We have already recommended increased planning at the local level to resolve part of the difficulty in program development. We now stress that one goal of that planning be creating better linkages between the classroom and the services provided rather than having one supplant the other.

11. Development of Alternative Models of Parent Participation

No program -- high school or middle school, AIDP or DPP -- has developed a satisfactory way for integrating parents into the efforts to reduce their youngsters' truancy-related problems. Indeed knowledge about this subject seemed to be especially inadequate. More information about successful alternative approaches involving parents of at-risk adolescents and some conscious program modeling are required to advance the state of the art. CBOs are likely sources of strength in this effort.

12. Dropout Prevention in Concert with General School Improvement

The effectiveness of dropout prevention efforts is ultimately dependent on the schools' directing resources and attention to their overall

instructional policies and considering how those policies interact with their specific dropout prevention programs. This is one of the basic insights of the DPP high school program which needs to be introduced into the other program concepts and better defined in the DPP high school initiative. If the at-risk are to succeed in mainstreamed academic programs, a host of issues from school and class size, admissions, credit, and security policies, to the focus on instruction and quality of staff development activities must be addressed.

Efforts to redesign schools and improve performance relative to the Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) provide an ideal opportunity for schools to develop structures and policies that are more sensitive to the needs of underachievers. We call upon New York City school officials charged with overseeing these initiatives and the new State Deputy Commissioner for school improvement in New York City to ensure that the (CAR) schools' plans to meet the new standards include inauguration of special transitional programs to reintegrate at-risk students into mainstreamed classes, identification and support of youngsters beginning to become truant or fail courses, and a general review of the instructional policies.

Chapter 4

Findings

The findings of our study of dropout prevention programs in 17 schools will be presented in four general sections. The first includes data relevant to how well programs were implemented and what obstacles to implementation existed. The second section presents staff's evaluations of various aspects of the program and their suggestions for reform. The third section considers students' satisfaction with program activities/ staff. In the final section, we examine characteristics of the larger school context which influence the task of dropout prevention.

I. Program Implementation

Level of Program Implementation. The extent to which programs were implemented was assessed in two ways. First, we created an index of the proportion of the personnel budget that had not been expended by the end of the first half of the school year due to hiring delays.[1] Second, we identified specific program services which were not provided or which were not supplied at the level intended even though the service provider was in place.

Personnel. In Table 1 the average percent of personnel budget dollars that were not spent is arrayed by program type; these values are expressed as "percent funds accruing" to the next year's budget. The values show that some program types had very little money left unspent by mid-year while others had as much as one-fifth remaining. This indicates that some programs had successfully hired program personnel during the fall and that others were still in the process of hiring staff as late as February, 1986.

It is important to note that the percentage figures represent conservative estimates of program accruals. For example, in many cases only the month in which a staff member was hired was supplied. In those cases we pro-rated budget expenditures from the first of that month. In addition, in order to give schools the benefit of the doubt, we assumed that staff members who had not been hired by the time of our February data collection would be hired in that month.

It is evident from the table that high school programs with the exception of the CBO component of these programs were well implemented at least with respect to the percent of staff that had been hired. The high school CBO components and all parts of the middle school programs, on the other hand, had substantially greater difficulty in bringing their full staff on board. Delays in programs operated by CBOs were to be expected as contract negotiations with the Board of Education were quite protracted.

---

1 These delays, of course, generally do not result in actual accruals because variances are obtained enabling the school to reassign the money to alternative uses in the program.

Table 1

Implementation Data: Percent of Funds Accruing Due to Start Up Delays

Programs	% Funds Accruing
AIDP High Schools	
Soar (N=2)	1.%
Strategies (N=1)	6.%
DPP High Schools (N=6)	
School Component	6.5%
CBO Component	21.0%
AIDP Middle Schools (N=4)	23.0%
DPP Middle Schools (N=4)	
School Component	18.5%
CBO Component	22.8%

* "N" equals the number of schools in the sample.

Service provision. In order to determine whether staff who had been hired were able to carry out all their prescribed functions, we asked the staff members we interviewed to identify any tasks that they were not executing at all or in full. Again, it is clear that, in general, high school programs with the exception of CBO components fared better than middle school programs.

High school programs failed to implement a number of program elements, such as tutoring and group counseling services in AIDP programs and tutoring, staff development and some clubs and after school classes in DPP programs. High school CBO staff reported failure to provide substantial numbers and kinds of services, including jobs and vocational training for the most part and extracurricular activities and parent groups to a lesser extent. Again, this delay flowed from the late approval of contracts.

Middle school programs also had not implemented a number of services. In AIDP schools a large proportion of planned after school activities were not taking place in 3 of 4 schools visited; in addition staff reported not yet being able to provide attendance incentives, group counseling, and parent workshops among other items. In DPP middle schools, where CBOs were responsible for the bulk of program services, school staff appeared to be carrying out most of their assigned tasks. CBO staff, however, reported failure to implement significant program elements such as, a.m. school, p.m. school classes, health screening, and career awareness workshops. In one school the lack of an available telephone prevented staff from making contacts with students' families.

As a kind of validity check on the data described above and of interest in its own right is the finding that 13 of 17 principals interviewed expressed difficulty in implementing their programs. Of the four who did not perceive any difficulty, one had a SOAR program; the other three did not take into account the CBO components of their program and were, in fact, the DPP schools which showed fairly high levels of implementation of the school component of the program.

Obstacles to Program Implementation. Principals, program facilitators, and staff members were asked what difficulties they had in implementing the program and why. Principals answered these questions from the point of view of general program management; staff addressed the particular program elements which they were struggling to implement.

Problems with program management. Congruent with the levels of staff deployment described above, principals cited the difficulty of recruiting teachers and hiring CBO staff as the chief obstacle to implementing their programs. The <u>hiring of CBO staff</u> lay clearly beyond the sphere of school responsibility: schools had reached agreements with their CBOs about the kind of program that the CBOs would set up in the schools (where schools were given this role), but in every case it was the failure of the Board of Education to process CBO contracts on a timely basis which prevented CBOs from introducing themselves in the schools early in the school year.

Teacher recruitment on the other hand was an in-house issue. Program budgets very often allocated funds for per session hours to pay teachers and counselors to carry out before or after school programs. Virtually all schools with per session funds, however, had difficulty attracting the number of staff members required to execute the activities which had been planned to occur outside the normal school day.

A third commonly cited obstacle to implementation was the lack of space needed to accommodate new staff members. All the DPP high schools, which had both systemic and CBO program components and, thus, large program staffs, were unable to provide adequate space and facilities for their personnel. Middle schools also reported space shortages. Consequently, even though the full staff was not on board in any of the schools, there was not enough space to physically accommodate the staff that was present. DPP facilities, often a large room or suite of small offices, were crowded with people each trying to conduct business with students or other staff in the midst of many others; they were noisy, and there were constant interruptions. Likewise, counselors had to share their offices with other counselors with the result that they could not see the number of students dictated by their caseloads because their requirements for student privacy could not be met.

Finally, inadequate mechanisms for program planning were often cited as a hindrance to program implementation. Among AIDP middle schools the Board's lack of provision for pre-planning was bitterly resented. School administrations expressed a preference for beginning program planning in June of the preceding year, but the reality was that they were handed program guidelines at the start of the school year. Consequently, routine programming which had already taken place in the schools often conflicted with the new requirements of the dropout prevention effort. DPP middle schools did not make the same complaint since they did not provide services themselves, rather the CBOs did.

In DPP high schools, where summer planning was budgeted and carried out, planning was deemed inadequate for on-going needs. AIDP high school program staff expressed the same difficulty. These programs found it difficult to establish common planning periods for program staff during the school year that could be used to coordinate activities and solve problems as they arose. Clearly, it was not easy to schedule several staff for a common period especially in schools which used multiple day schedules to accommodate large enrollments in which cases staff were arriving and leaving school at different times of the day.

Problems with program elements. In some AIDP middle schools, staff reported being unable to implement budgeted incentive programs (awards/prizes for attendance) and other activities on account of the Board's unresponsiveness to their request for funds for these items. Further, some programs were unable to bring parents in for conferences in the numbers they intended. Again, staff placed the blame on lack of response. In DPP middle schools, there was only one program which

reported failure to implement a service because they could not get funds released for it. Generally speaking, there was little convergence across DPP middle schools on the program elements that were most troublesome to set up; staff in each school reported a number of activities that had not been adequately implemented, but these varied from school to school.

Staff in one AIDP high school also were frustrated in trying to gain access to or get reimbursed for funds for their incentive program. Additionally, and more generally, AIDP schools had trouble making their tutorials conform to the Board of Education's program guidelines and arranging a linkage with their feeder middle schools. In both cases, the schools cited vague and delayed communication from the Board regarding these particular program activities. DPP high schools reported having problems implementing some parts of their programs, e.g., p. m. school, mini-school; they shared no common denominators in terms of program types or source of problems, however.

Finally, nearly every school logged their sense of frustration in getting students to participate in the program. Staff reported difficulty contacting students in the community, getting them to attend activities once they were in school, enthusing and motivating them. This fact is hardly surprising given that it is the very problem the staff are supposed to address. Student disinterest does not account for lack of program attendance in every case, however. In both DPP high schools and AIDP middle schools staff felt that insufficient effort had been made to inform students of the availability of program activities; and in DPP middle schools staff reported that teachers were reluctant to release students from classes to attend these activities.

II. Staff Evaluations of the Program

Several questions were framed to elicit staff's appraisal of and satisfaction with specific dimensions of their program. For example, staff members were asked to name the best and worst parts of the program; to rate their satisfaction with the major tasks they carried out; to judge the CBO's contribution (where this was relevant); to discuss the level of input they had into program design and the program's impact. Their responses have been organized around program issues which we view as playing key roles in the ultimate success or failure of these programs.

Satisfaction with program governance. No other issue generated more discussion and concern than the manner in which the Board of Education collaborated with schools in implementing the dropout prevention programs. Two very different styles of collaboration were evident across schools: AIDP high school programs and all middle school programs were highly prescriptive and did not allow for much input from the schools. DPP high school programs, on the other hand, permitted school staff to shape their program in large part. The impact of the different styles became clear in the context of staffs' responses to questions about obstacles to timely

program implementation. We also asked principals and staff directly about their satisfaction with the level of input they had into program design and with the monitoring procedures with which they had to abide.

Program input. Principals were asked to indicate the level of input they and their staff had in the design of their program and the significance that carried for them. Responses to the first question were nearly dichotomous: Some schools had almost complete say in program design; others had none. Table 2 shows the percent input into program design principals and staff said they had across school programs. The small amount of variability in these responses within each program type suggests that they are reliable. It can be seen that staff in all middle schools, regardless of whether they were AIDP or DPP, had next to no input into determining the shape of their dropout prevention efforts. In addition, the staff of high school SOAR programs had no say. By sharp contrast, the staff of the high school with a strategies program and all staff of high schools with systemic programs felt they controlled program design to a very great extent. In these schools, principals reported that the superintendent of dropout prevention also had a small role to play. Only in the one DPP high school with a CBO-dominant program did the staff appear to play a more intermediate role.

In order to determine the significance of having a lot or no input into the design of the program, we asked principals to discuss any problems they had with the amount of input they had. Principals of middle schools voiced decided unhappiness with the fact they were handed a program as opposed to allowed to help shape one. Specifically, some principals expressed the feeling that they simply did not know what was going on -- that they were responsible for a program for which they were supplied no rationale. Several principals complained that because they had had no input, the program was not tailored to their schools' needs, e.g., one identified the need for staff development, an item for which there was no budgetary consideration. Other principals expressed strong dissatisfaction with the lack of wisdom of student eligibility criteria and the limited provision for program leadership, i.e., a .4 full time equivalent (FTE) program facilitator instead of the full FTE facilitator they felt the program required.

Principals of high schools with SOAR or the CBO-dominant programs expressed similar dissatisfactions with having to work within program guidelines not of their own choosing. The former would have preferred to broaden student eligibility criteria and to develop jobs for students; the latter would have chosen another CBO.

Monitoring procedures. We asked principals how they they felt about the procedures the Board imposed on the schools for monitoring and evaluation purposes. While a few middle school principals and a similar number of high school principals expressed appreciation for the need for program evaluation, the overwhelming majority of principals complained about the burden these procedures placed on school staff. Five of eight middle

Table 2

Average Percent of Input Into Program Design

Programs	Average % Input
AIDP High Schools	
Soar (N=2)	0%
Strategies (N=1)	85%
DPP High Schools	
Systemic (N=5)	82%
CBO only (N=1)	30%
AIDP Middle Schools (N=4)	03%
DPP Middle Schools (N=4)	0%

school principals and seven of nine high school principals held this view. Further, when staff members were asked to enumerate the worst aspects of their programs, no item was mentioned more frequently than the onerous amount of paperwork they were required to produce to document program service delivery; staff were required to note all student contacts, placements, and referrals.

Evaluation of program staff. Principals widely indicated that program staff were selected on the basis of special competencies and general suitability for working with dropout prone youth. Exceptions to this were found at the middle school level where principals of two AIDP and two DPP programs reported that staff had been selected on the basis of seniority. In one of these cases, a principal's choice for program facilitator had been contested by another faculty member and reversed--on the basis of his senior status. For the most part, however, program staff (excluding CBO personnel) tended to be newer faculty members: 70% of staff members had been in the school fewer than ten years across both high and middle schools; in fact, in middle schools, nearly a third of the non-CBO staff were new that year. In view of these facts, middle schools appeared to have the worst of both worlds in that they more often selected staff on the basis of seniority alone and had new, inexperienced staff with which to contend.

In addition, we asked principals to assess their staff's need for special training for dropout prevention assignments. All principals said that staff needed special training for their work, but only a smaller number acknowledged that they were not able to provide such training for their staff. In particular, principals with SOAR programs indicated a lack of staff training. This is not surprising given that these programs place special demands on teachers in terms of curriculum development and instructional technique geared to at-risk students. Two principals with systemic programs and two principals at the middle school level also expressed a need for staff training. These data may well underrepresent the true need for training, however, since it was our impression that principals were reluctant to portray their staff as inadequate.

Evaluation of the CBO component. We asked the principals as well as school staff to evaluate the CBOs contribution. Principals uniformly characterized CBO staff as bringing special strengths to the dropout prevention initiative. These strengths were identified in terms of their having greater familiarity with the communities and families of at risk students and especially relevant counseling skills in such areas as crisis intervention, family therapy, and vocational guidance; weaknesses were perceived as the CBOs' lack of familiarity with school procedures and students.

School staff with few exceptions echoed their principal's endorsement of CBO staff; nearly all felt the CBO had been helpful. There was a hint of competitiveness between school and CBO counselors as revealed in one

counselor's comment that the CBO staff got the challenging counseling assignments while school counselors were relegated the routine academic monitoring and paperwork.

Satisfaction with student eligibility criteria. Another issue which we explored carefully was the staff's view of the criteria which were used to include or exclude students from direct services. Strict guidelines regarding students' eligibility had been set in the 1985-86 legislation. We wished to determine staff's response. Principals were asked to evaluate the appropriateness of the criteria. The majority judged them to be misguided. Interestingly enough three of four school principals who did not complain about them had systemic programs which were allowed to target all students in the ninth and tenth grades; the other had a middle school CBO-only program. Of those who complained, most felt the criteria were too restrictive and needed to be expanded to include less seriously truant students. Principals indicated these "borderline" students were more motivated to attend, but evidenced problems which could lead to more serious truancy and dropout; they reasoned that efforts directed at these students were more likely to produce results, whereas intervention with the targeted students would be futile. Some felt that the criteria should be expanded to include "cutters" and students who were consistently late as well. Only one principal suggested the criteria should include even harder core students, that is, the long-term absentee or student who is enrolled but does not attend and cannot be located easily.

Program staff were also asked whether they felt there were students in need of dropout prevention services who had been excluded from them. The majority across all programs, 82% of all respondents, said yes. The list of needy students they collectively generated suggests the depth and breadth of the at-risk student population, only a percentage of which are served by dropout prevention programs. The list includes:

academically handicapped students such as PREP students
cutters
transfers
all entering ninth graders--they are undergoing a stressful transition year
students experiencing a new culture such as those from the Caribbean and Central America
students with behavior problems
students with multiple family problems who may need counseling and positive role models
Special Education students
students who currently manifest serious truancy (as opposed to showed the problem last year)
any student who wants to participate on account of interest in a particular activity that is offered
students in the 6th and 7th grades who have not yet developed bad habits
all students--they are all at-risk in this school

When staff members were asked whether there were targetted students for whom the program did not work, again, a majority, 72%, responded affirmatively. Their characterization of these students agreed with some principals' view that incorrigibles had been selected to participate in the program. That is, staff at the high school and, to a lesser extent, at the middle school level felt that there were students with severe emotional problems, from troubled families, whose parents had failed to instill a valuing of educational goals, who had disciplinary problems or used drugs that were simply beyond help. Further, some staff believed students with poor attendance who were academically handicapped and overage could not benefit from the program.

Satisfaction with program design. Principals and program staff were given several opportunities to evaluate the design of their programs. Principals were asked to identify the best and worst parts of their programs and the changes that needed to be made to improve them. Staff were queried in a parallel manner. Their responses have been organized into three categories to sharpen our understanding of the 1) strengths of current programs; 2) changes that could improve programs at current funding levels; and 3) additional features which are needed to optimize existing program designs--which would also require additional funding. In Table 3, these three categories of responses are arrayed by program type; distinctions between different types of AIDP and DPP programs are not made since differences in program content are minimal. Only comments that appeared to have some currency among staff are included in the table; in other words, idiosyncratic remarks were discarded. Comments that were made by staff in every program of a given type are underlined. Discussion of these data will follow the order in which program types are presented in the table.

SOAR/Strategies High Schools. The most effective features cited by staff define the essential character of SOAR and Strategies programs: small classes (20 students) which have curriculum tailored to the needs of unmotivated students and which provide closer relationships between teachers and students and among students.

Ways in which existing program designs could be enhanced included both curriculum and staff development. Staff expressed the need for better curriculum and equipment and materials to support the curriculum. They also felt teaching would be more effective if some teachers were to adopt a more constructive attitude about educating difficult students. A problem that was unique to these programs since they were the only ones which programmed students into special classes was that students felt their peers thought of them as Special Education students or as different; staff felt that this labeling needed to be addressed in some way. Finally, staff indicated that reducing the amount of paperwork they had to do would increase their level of contact with students.

Table 3

Program Descriptions, Most Effective Features, and Changes Needs to Enhance and Complement Current Program Designs

Program Type	Most Effective Features
AIDP High Schools: Blocked classes with special focus curriculum, guidance and outreach.	Small classes, tailored curriculum, better supervision, more contact between teachers and students, group cohesion.
DPP High Schools: CBO case management; school-wide activities, guidance and outreach.	Conflict mediation training, vocational training, counseling, attendance monitoring, outreach, private business program, jobs, incentives, high interest activities.
AIDP Middle Schools: Curricular and recreational offerings, tutoring, guidance and outreach.	Before/after/Saturday curricular and extracurricular activities, tutoring, personalized attention to students, incentives, attendance monitoring, home visits, counseling.
DPP Middle Schools: CBO curricular and recreational activities, tutoring; guidance and outreach.	Same as for AIDP middle schools

Table 3 (cont'd.)

Changes Needed to Enhance Existing Program	Changes Needed to Complement Existing Program
Curriculum development, more equipment/materials, overcome labelling, more dedicated staff, less paperwork.	Social services, jobs, career awareness, community support, parent involvement.
Organizational development: better staff and staff/CBO coordination, articulation between counseling and teaching functions and across programs, more space; greater student awareness of program, feelings of belonging to program, less paperwork.	Academic component: transition for returned truants, more high interest academic offerings (remedial, vocational, sex/parenting classes), mini-school, tutoring; extracurriculars, jobs, childcare, better middle/high school linkage, student input, staff development, more staff, parent involvement.
Organizational development: better staff coordination, network of AIDP staff across schools, program coherence; greater student awareness, group cohesion, better trained/supervised tutors, more dedicated staff, less paperwork.	Social services, more varied high interest curriculum and activities, school-wide attendance incentives, staff development, more guidance and outreach staff, parent involvement.
Organizational development: school/CBO coordination; more equipment/materials, better trained tutors, more regular system of meeting with students, less paperwork.	Expanded high-interest curriculum, incentives, trips outside neighborhood, vocational training, more guidance and outreach staff, parent involvement.

Features which needed to be added to these programs to maximize their effectiveness resembled the kinds of services that CBOs supplied in other schools. These were social services and job preparation/vocational counseling. In addition staff strongly supported the idea of placing their students in jobs. Other features which they felt their programs needed included more community support especially in the form of job programs and greater parental support of and involvement in their dropout prevention effort.

DPP High Schools. DPP high school programs consisted of CBO counseling services for truants and a systemic component devoted to general school improvement which included a variety of efforts to improve school security, student participation in school life, etc. Staff cited a wide assortment of program offerings as being especially beneficial. These included CBO type services such as mediation training, vocational training and intensive counseling; private business programs and staff-developed jobs; and in-house services such as rewards/incentives for school attendance, high interest classes, extracurricular activities, attendance monitoring and outreach to absentees.

The chief way in which they believed their programs could be enhanced was through improving the organization and management of them. This was not surprising given the scope of services and number of staff members associated with these programs. Specifically, staff reported the need for better coordination between school and CBO personnel and among school staff; better articulation of counseling and teaching functions which sometimes compete for the same student; better integration and less redundancy of services across the several high school programs; and more office space to accommodate the increased number of school personnel. Secondly, staff indicated that greater effort to inform students of program offerings and even of the existence of the program was needed and that students' sense of belonging to a program should be strengthened. Lastly, staff complained that the paperwork was excessive.

Staff had several suggestions for expanding current programs. Even though these programs provided a variety of services, staff expressed the view that current offerings had limitations. In contrast to the AIDP programs which revolved around blocked classes, but lacked social services, DPP programs supplied CBO services in the absence of substantive curricular structures in many cases. Chief among them was the lack of a mechanism for easing the returned truant into regular classes. Staff were keenly aware that students who had fallen behind their classmates because of their absenteeism would flounder once they were reintroduced into the classroom and most likely return to previous patterns of truancy. In fact, the failure to provide such a transition aid emerged as a central irony of these programs: while considerable effort was expended on student outreach, i.e., getting the student to come to school, little forethought appeared to have been given to a method for remediating students to make them class-ready. To address this need one school set up an "academic mentoring room" during the second half of the school year; existing funds were reallocated for two teachers each of whom would tutor returned truants for two periods a day.

In addition, staff of DPP programs wanted to expand offerings of high interest academic classes of a remedial as well as vocational and special interest nature (e,g., sex education and parenting classes). Some felt the best form of providing these would be a mini-school tailored to motivating truants (as one school had). Other staff felt the addition of tutoring, extracurricular activities, job placement, and/or childcare services was needed to give truants the full complement of support they required to succeed in school. A more elaborate system for smoothing middle school students' transition to high school also was deemed important. While middle/high school linkage programs were included in current program designs, some judged them to be inadequate. Finally, student input into program design, staff development, greater parent involvement, and more staff to provide services were cited as items which could profitably enlarge the scope of existing programs.

AIDP Middle Schools. AIDP middle school programs consisted of school-based (as opposed to CBO-based) academic classes, recreational activities, tutoring, guidance and outreach for truants. As with high school programs, AIDP middle school program staff gave high marks to their programs. They valued the expanded school day as a means of providing truants with more engaging activities; they judged the tutoring and increased individualized attention to students as crucial; they found the incentives, attendance monitoring, and counseling very helpful.

Given the multiplicity of services to integrate in these programs, it is not surprising that one of the ways in which staff felt the program could be most improved was through an improved orchestration of services. Specifically, staff cited the need for better staff coordination, program coherence and a network of AIDP staff across middle school programs for sharing information. As with high school DPP programs, staff also felt students did not participate to the extent they should because they lacked awareness of program offerings and if they did participate lacked any sense of group cohesion. Staff inadequacies were also issues for these programs: staff cited the need to better train and supervise the tutors used in the program and to attract more dedicated teachers. Finally, a reduction in paperwork was sought.

Staff of AIDP middle school programs wanted to complement their existing programs with both more of the same and different activities. For example, many staff members thought their current curricular offerings were not varied enough and should be expanded; they wanted to extend incentives for attendance to all students. At the same time they felt that the need for social and intensive counseling services which was met by CBOs in other types of programs was not addressed in their own. They also expressed a need to augment their own guidance and outreach staff, to have staff development take place and to collaborate with parents in attempting to improve their children's attendance.

DPP Middle Schools. DPP middle school programs offered essentially the same array of activities as did AIDP programs but did so through CBO personnel. Again, staff affirmed the value of these services and the general thrust of the program model.

Their suggestions for improving the existing program included increasing coordination between the school and the CBO staff, supporting activities with more equipment and materials, and providing training for tutors. Staff felt a more regular system of meeting with students needed to be built into the program. These staff members also indicated that reducing the amount of paperwork they had to do would be a boon to their work.

Staff wanted to round out their current program offerings by expanding their high-interest curriculum and system of incentives, by conducting trips outside the school neighborhood, and by providing vocational training. As for AIDP middle schools, staff in DPP middle schools felt more school guidance and outreach staff were required to serve truants effectively. Finally, staff believed that the need for parental support of their objectives had to be addressed in a programmatic way.

Summary. By way of summarizing these important data on the adequacy of program designs from the point of view of those who have the greatest familiarity with them, two points can be made. First, program staff widely endorsed the services they were currently providing; no single type of service was identified as misguided or lacking in potential usefulness. This is a striking finding given the diversity of services represented by these programs and the general frankness with which we observed staff to respond to our questions. It is also an extremely important finding in view of the Board's responsibility for organizing a city-wide dropout prevention effort based upon meaningful, potentially effective strategies of intervention.

Second, no single type of program was fully adequate: program staff at each school we visited indicated that current services were appropriate but limited in important respects. Interestingly, the services that typified one program were often cited as a missing element of another. For example, SOAR and strategies programs, both classroom-based models, lacked social services and vocational training, in a word, CBO type services; high school DPP programs often evidenced the notable absence of specific academic/curricular interventions for truants.

Satisfaction with program funding. The schools' appraisal of program shortfalls such as the above lead logically to questions of the adequacy of funding for the programs. We asked principals to evaluate both per capita spending and the size of their overall budget in relation to the scope of their attendance/dropout problem. Their responses provided additional insight into the inherent limitations of different program models.

All program models' budgets were based in part on a $1000/student ratio. AIDP and DPP programs in middle schools received a base amount of $150,000 and were instructed to serve 150 truants; AIDP high school programs were allocated approximately $200,000 to serve 150 truants and to cover a limited number of related needs. A different funding formula was used for DPP high schools: they received $150,000 plus $1000 x the number of

students that matched the attendance criteria; the number of students was based on the size of each school's qualifying population. DPP budgets were as large as $800,000 or $900,000 in some cases. Importantly, while middle school and AIDP high school program dollars had to be spent on services for targetted truants only, DPP high schools were able to spend money on general school improvement as well as CBO services to truants.

Principals of DPP high schools were satisfied with per capita spending--perhaps because per capita spending was less relevant to their efforts than the overall size of their budgets. Principals of AIDP high schools and both AIDP and DPP middle school programs, however, tended to view per capita spending as inadequate. That is, in those schools which were held to spending $1000/student and in the high schools, somewhat more, principals felt the per capita spending level was not high enough to meet students' needs. AIDP high school principals indicated that current per capita spending could not be stretched to cover the costs of texts and curricular materials, incentives, and other equipment they viewed as program requisites. Middle school principals said per capita spending did not permit staffing levels commensurate with student needs. They cited the .4 FTE allocation for a program facilitator as an example of funding inadequacy; there was consensus that one FTE was required to manage the program effectively. In addition, middle school principals said per capita spending did not begin to cover the costs of the additional staff, particularly guidance and outreach staff, they felt were needed.

When principals were asked whether their program dollars reached the numbers of students who required assistance, a different pattern of responses was obtained. All DPP and AIDP high school principals expressed the view that their budget did not address the full scope of the attendance/dropout problem in their school; half of the middle school principals endorsed that view.

High school principals defined the scope of the problem in terms that tended to correspond with their particular program model. That is, consistent with the systemic concept, most DPP high school principals said their budgets should be augmented to permit them to direct school-wide improvement efforts at all students in the school, instead of only ninth and tenth graders. They seemed committed to the view that overall school improvement was needed to effect substantial change in attendance and dropout rates. AIDP high school principals wanted increased spending in order to serve the much larger numbers of at-risk students in their schools than were stipulated by the Board. Of those middle school principals who felt overall program spending was inadequate, some desired additional funds for school-wide improvement; others wanted money to serve larger numbers of needy students.

Job satisfaction. In addition to assessing how principals and program staff viewed various aspects of the programs in which they took part, we examined staff's satisfaction with the major tasks they performed. Staff

members were asked to name the central tasks they carried out; to rate their level of satisfaction with these activities on a 5-point scale where 1 is not satisfied and 5 is very satisfied; and to indicate their reasons for the ratings they made. An individual's satisfaction ratings were then averaged across activities. Table 4 contains average satisfaction ratings for guidance counselors, teachers, paraprofessional staff, e.g., family assistant, and CBO staff by each of the four types of programs included in our sample. The average ratings are based on a small number of employees, but reflect the steady trends in staff responses that were observed. In any case, we use these data to make only general points about staff satisfaction.

At the most general level Table 4 shows that staff satisfaction was average (3.0) or above average in every category except teachers in AIDP high schools. This finding suggests there there may be no pervasive morale problem among staff and probably reflects another general finding that staff felt current programs were basically sound, if in need of expansion. The below average ratings of teachers in AIDP high school programs deserve attention, however, since these individuals have the most direct and sustained contact with truant students of any school employee. The aspect of their job that they least liked was tutoring students during the period of the day that had set aside for it; they never gave a rating of above 2 on this activity. The reasons for their dissatisfaction included their feeling that too little planning and organization had guided the implementation of the tutorial sessions and that students were too unmotivated to attend regularly. Ratings of their instructional assignments were somewhat higher, about average. The reasons that these ratings were not higher concerned lack of curriculum planning and the lack of challenge inhering in teaching low-level curricula.

Table 4 also reveals that CBO staff were among those staff members who expressed the highest levels of satisfaction with their jobs. This is an important finding given the near-experimental quality of including CBOs in school dropout prevention programs; it indicates that CBO staffs are relatively content with their new roles in the school. It may also be significant that school guidance counselors who worked with CBO staff and shared common tasks with them rated their job a full point higher on the average than those counselors who did not collaborate with CBOs.

Appraisal of program impact. Since programs had not been fully implemented and could not be expected to demonstrate effects on student attendance and dropout by mid-year, we deemed it important to examine staff's personal expectations and observations of success and the "side effects" that programs may have already had on the school. A formative evaluation of this type can offer greater explanation of later program success/failure than an evaluation of the success/failure criteria alone. We asked principals and staff whether they thought the program was having a positive effect on students and in what other ways the program affected school.

Table 4

Staff Members' Average Level of Satisfaction with Their Job[a]

Programs	Counselors	Teachers	Para-professionals	CBO Staff
AIDP High Schools[b]	3.3 (3)	2.3 (4)	4.0 (3)	-
DPP High Schools	4.4 (7)	3.4 (6)	4.4 (7)	4.1 (8)
AIDP Middle Schools[b]	3.1 (4)	3.5 (6)	4.3 (5)	-
DPP Middle Schools	4.3 (3)	3.8 (5)	3.7 (2)	4.1 (8)

[a] Numbers in parentheses represent the number of employees who provided ratings.

[b] No CBO Staff were included in program.

Specifically, we asked principals whether their program seemed to be improving student attendance. Nearly all felt students' attendance had increased as a result of participating in the program; a few expressed the view that it was too soon to tell. Principals also indicated whether they thought the program had improved student academic performance. Less than half felt it had; the majority thought it was premature to make a judgment since classroom performance might take longer to change than attendance. Not surprisingly, staff of middle school programs tended to endorse present program effectiveness the least strongly of any group probably owing to the weak implementation of their programs. Virtually all staff members felt that their program would improve student attendance in the future.

Principals were also asked to comment on the kind of effect their program had had on non-targetted students, teaching faculty, and school management. Almost every principal thought the program had positively influenced students who did not participate in the program; they felt these students were "soaking up" the extra school support and emphasis on attendance. There was, however, some sense that PREP students had been shortchanged in the process of shifting attention away from academic handicaps to truancy.

With regard to the impact of programs on teachers, principals' responses were more mixed. The majority indicated that the program had helped teachers in as much as it provided them with a referral system and, to a lesser extent, because it supplied staff development, increased attendance monitoring, and sometimes smaller classes. Several principals, however, identified negative effects on teachers. These included greater class preparation requirements, more paperwork, having to handle an increased number of disciplinary problems (because truants were back in school), and having students "pulled out" of class to participate in the program.

Interestingly, the majority of principals took a rather dim view of the program's impact on school management and, perhaps, more particularly, on them. Twelve principals (out of 17) felt the dropout prevention programs increased the difficulty and complexity of school administration since it simply added to the number of programs and staff to monitor. This finding deserves serious consideration given the truly extensive number and diversity of programs that exist in the schools. Some of these principals also cited the inadequacy of space, materials, and security that had resulted from the introduction of these programs to their school. On the other hand, several principals cited positive effects such as the more effective handling of student problems with more specialized personnel and the freeing up of staff to work on tasks more in line with their expectations and, finally, the general improvement in the climate of the school. Neither positive or negative evaluations emanated from any particular type of program.

III. Student Satisfaction

As had been done with staff, students were asked to identify the best and worst features of the program in which they participated; to explain how the program could be more helpful; to rate their satisfaction with the program overall and more specifically with the program activities and staff who carried them out; and, finally, to indicate whether the program had helped them to come to school more often. The results of the analyses of their responses are discussed below.

Satisfaction with program. Students were given the opportunity to indicate how well they liked the program in general; they were asked whether they liked the program "a lot", "a little", or "not at all." The percentage of students who liked the program a lot is shown for each program category in Table 5. Quite large majorities of students (70%-80%) reported strong liking for their program with the exception of students in DPP middle schools where a more moderate majority (60%) did so. Again this program suffered from very late implementation.

To gain a more specific understanding of student satisfaction, students also were asked to identify program staff with whom they had had contact during the first half of the school year and to indicate whether they liked the "kind of things you talk about or do together" "a lot", "a little", or "not at all." The percentage of their responses which fell into the "a lot" category for each of the four program types is presented in Table 5. It can be seen that the overwhelming majority of responses indicated a strong liking for program activities in both AIDP and DPP high school programs and in AIDP middle school programs; in DPP middle school programs a moderate majority of responses expressed the same degree of liking.

The reasons students gave for their ratings revealed that they simply enjoyed the staff persons with whom they interacted: students reported that these persons were "nice," "fun," "understanding," "concerned," and "helpful." Some also mentioned that they found the activities fun and interesting and that they were getting more than in "regular school." Students in high school programs were more likely than middle school students to say they relished having someone to talk to; in addition, students in high school programs which placed students in jobs expressed especially strong, positive feelings about their job. DPP middle school students' explanations of their low ratings of staff and activities concerned their dislike of talking about their problems with both school and CBO counselors.

---

2 Students in one DPP high school program were dropped from this analysis because they had no knowledge of a dropout prevention program per se.

Table 5

Indicators of Student Satisfaction[a]

Programs	% Students Liking Program A Lot	% Students Saying Program Helped Them Come to School More
AIDP High Schools	70% (10)	80% (10)
DPP High Schools	80% (19)	95% (19)
AIDP Middle Schools	75% (20)	74% (19)
DPP Middle Schools	60% (20)	67% (18)

[a] Numbers in parentheses represent the number of employees who provided ratings.

Program impact. Students were asked whether their attendance had improved this year and, if it had, whether the program was responsible. The percentage of student respondents who said the program had improved their attendance across the four types of programs is included in Table 5. Again, four of the five students interviewed in one DPP high school were dropped from this analysis because they were not aware that a specific dropout prevention program existed in their school. These statistics show a somewhat different pattern of responses than students' satisfaction ratings. DPP high school students more often perceived their program to have helped them improve their attendance than students in any other program. A high percentage of AIDP high school students also gave their program credit for improving their attendance. Just under 3/4 of the students in AIDP middle school programs said their programs were effective, while 2/3 of students in the DPP middle school programs did so.

Among students who said the program had been helpful, there was little variation across programs in the type of explanation students supplied for why the program had helped them. Students most often reported they had begun coming to school more often because they received more academic assistance; more concern, attention, and support from staff; and because they had been impressed with the importance of attending for later schooling and employment.

IV. Dropout Prevention and School Environment

Since programs operate within the larger context of the school, we recognized that these contextual variables can act to support or diminish program efforts. To widely varying degrees across the different programs, student spend their time interacting with non-program staff in non-program activities: Students in SOAR spent substantial school time in their program; other students persued normal activities for the most part. We examine below principals' views of features of the school environment which seem to pose significant obstacles to the task of dropout prevention.

School size. All but one high school principal and one middle school principal held the view that reducing the size of schools would further the cause of dropout prevention. Although the educational literature and previous studies by PEA have documented the positive effects of small schools, it is nevertheless surprising that school administrators felt as they did since it is often the case that they derive additional power, prestige, and resources from managing large schools.

When asked what the ideal school size would be, high school principals produced answers which ranged from 1000 to 2500; the average was 1800 students. Middle school principals' answers ranged from 250 to 1200 and averaged 700 students. The average size obtained for high schools is far below the actual sizes of the high schools included in this study (2149-4114). The average size for middle schools is also smaller than most of those in the study (605-1306).

Some of the reasons that large schools make dropout prevention more difficult emerged from questions we posed staff members: 1) Larger schools are often overcrowded: Students must attend school on staggered schedules; staff have far less office space than they require. These conditions constitute stressors for everyone concerned. 2) The number of academic programs required to serve the large numbers of students with different needs produces an organizational complexity and fragmentation that leaves staff unsure of the school's direction and priorities.

Proportion of academically able students. Thirteen of seventeen school principals stated that schools needed a certain percentage of at or above grade level students to be effective overall. The minimum percentage of such students that they felt was needed ranged from 18% to 50%; the average was 38%. This majority view also finds support in the educational literature which advises a more hefty (50%) concentration of on or above grade level students.

Appendix A

Sampling and Interview Methods

Sample Selection

A total of 17 schools were included in this analysis; nine of these were high schools and eight were middle schools. They were selected on the basis of two criteria. First, we chose schools that had programs representative of the two broad types of programs that existed in city schools both at the high and middle school level: These were Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (AI/DP) programs that were funded with state monies alone and Dropout Prevention (DPP) programs which were supported by both state and city funds. Second, we chose those schools which had among the lowest attendance rates and highest dropout rates. By mandate only schools with the worst attendance and dropout problems received funds for programs; we identified the most troubled of these. Our interest was in assessing program implementation and effectiveness in schools which presented the greatest challenge to the dropout prevention initiative. Importantly, however, extensive discussions conducted with representatives of the Board of Education, various school districts, and CBOs subsequent to our investigation suggest that the findings appear to be generalizable to all schools with dropout prevention programs.

At the high school level, three AI/DP and six DPP schools were visited. Two of the AI/DP schools' programs were based on the Student Opportunity for Advancement and Retention (SOAR) model. The third AI/DP program, labelled Strategies, was structured very much like SOAR, in that it included blocked classes and augmented guidance and outreach, but the Strategies program had more flexibility in program design.

Five of the six DPP programs visited expended funds both on the general improvement of learning conditions for all students in the ninth and tenth grades and on services to target truants, in particular. A sixth DPP program which had less funding stressed case management services to target students for the most part and a small complement of other activities including a jobs program. All DPP programs visited included services provided by community-based organizations.

At the middle school level, four AI/DP programs and four DPP programs were examined. In AI/DP schools, services were supplied by school personnel only, while in DPP schools, CBO staff and to a limited extent school staff provide services.

Interviews

Structured interviews were conducted with the principal, program facilitator, program staff and students at each school we visited.

Principals and program facilitators were interviewed in November and December 1985; interviews with program staff and students were held in January and February 1986. Where possible five program staff members representative of the major personnel categories, i.e., teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals, and community-based organization (CBO) staff; and five students who participated in the program. In all, 17 principals, 17 facilitators, 75 program staff persons, and 75 students provided data for our analysis.

The interview items (see Appendix B) were constructed to address specific issues that had been identified in previous PEA studies as playing key roles in executing an effective dropout prevention initiative.

Both staff and students were assured that their responses to questions would be confidential and that the identity of their school would not be revealed.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW FORMS

SCHOOL: _____

INVESTIGATOR: _____

RESPONDENT(S): _____

_____

INTERVIEW DATE: _____

Principal/AIDP-DPP Coordinator Questionnaire

A. Characterize Program Implementation

1. About the School Attendance Program in General

a. Have you had an opportunity to complete the Data Collection Instrument we sent along in our November 25 letter?

If yes, ask for a copy and scan it for completeness.

If no, complete the instrument by asking the principal the appropriate questions.

b. Could you confirm and complete the budgetary information that we have for your AIDP/DPP program. (Hand principal and program coordinator a copy of a completed Data Collection Instrument and make additions & corrections as warranted on your copy.)

c. Have you had any difficulty finding staff to whom you could reassign the former responsibilities of AIDP personnel?

d. How many students were eligible for your AIDP or DPP program this year?

How did you arrive at that number?

Did you include special education students in that assessment?

Did you include students in English as a Second Language or bilingual programs?

e. How many students were targeted for services from among the eligibles?

How did you arrive at that number?

Does this include special education students?

Does this include students in English as a Second Language or bilingual programs?

2. The Adoption Process

a. If you had to divide up a ten slice pie to describe the degree of control you, your staff, your superintendent, central board of education personnel & staff of the community based organizations (if any) had in designing your AIDP or DPP program, how would you divide up the pie?

	Actual Allocation	Ideal Allocation
Principal		
Staff		
Superintendent		
BOE Supervisor*		
CBO		

b. Was that an ideal arrangement or do you think there is some other way of dividing up the input that would result in a better designed program? Make a reallocation based on what you would like to see. (Place this information above under "ideal allocation.")

c. Could you tell me what the problem was in having it the other way?

d. What, if any, problems emerged among those responsible for deciding program directions?

Did people have different ideas about what to do?

Were there any difficulties just getting people together to solve problems?

e. How much time did you have to develop your original proposal?

Was that adequate?

For schools contracting with CBOs only: How much time were you given to negotiate your contract(s) with the CBO?

Was that adequate?

How much time is needed to develop a program of this complexity?

f. What issues concerned you most in designing the program?

3. The Implementation Process

a. On what basis were staff selected for this program? Probe: Did staff tend to be selected on the basis of special competency? seniority? did they volunteer?

b. What accounted for any delays in hiring/assigning staff?

Can this be corrected in the future or is it a permanent problem?

c. You have explained when each staff member assigned to the program began functioning in their designated role, were there any interruptions in service?

What accounted for those interruptions?

d. Do you think that any kind of special training is necessary for staff in this program?

Was your school able to provide it?

If no, what should be done to help you in the future?

e. Has staff had difficulty implementing any aspect of the program? Please explain.

Can you suggest correctives.

f. Has the program fit in well with other attendance improvement or dropout prevention efforts in the school?

g. Are there any groups of students who have difficulty participating in the program?

Can PREP students, Special Education students and ESL students participate as easily as other students in the school?

h. If you have been working with a CBO, who on your staff and who on the staff of the CBO participated in the contract negotiations? Did anyone else participate?

Has working with a CBO presented any special problems?

Does the staff of the CBO have different strengths (in expertize or work ethnic) from school staff?

Does the staff of the CBO have different weaknesses (in expertize or work ethnic) from school staff?

Are CBO staff more costly than, less costly than or about as costly as traditional school staff given comparable activities?

Are your staff and the CBO staff working well together?

When ordinary difficulties emerge in the operation of the CBO/ school program, who in the school resolves those problems? Who from the CBO gets involved in settling difficulties? Has this process worked?

i. How was your overall budget for this project arrived at?

Was a limit set on overall spending/capita?

How was this arrived at?

4. Perceived Impact

a. What aspect of the AIDP/DPP program works best? Why?

What aspect works worst? Why?

b. Has the program improved youngsters' attendance in your judgment? What tells you that?

c. Has it improved youngsters "academic" performance? What tells you that?

d. Has the program had an effect on students besides those targetted?

e. Has this program hurt or helped teachers in any way?

f. Has the program made the operation of the school any easier?

Has it in any way made things operationally more difficult?

g. When would you expect to see results from this program?

5. Future Direction

a. Do the centrally mandated aspects of the AIDP/DPP program allow sufficient flexibility for you to design a program responsive to your school's special circumstances?

Are the resources provided by the Board of Education adequate on a per capita basis ? What would be? (This question may not be appropriate for those DPP schools following the "systemic" model of school improvement.)

Are the resources adequate given the scope of the problem in your school?

Are the constraints regarding student eligibility appropriate ?

Is the mandated size of the program (100-150 students in AIDP programs) appropriate? (This question may not be appropriate for "systemic" schools)

What about the rule regarding supplanting of resources? Has this presented any problems?

b. What changes need to be made in your individual school's program?

c. Should/could the program be expanded in your school?

Under what circumstances should the program be expanded

d. How have you felt about the monitoring, reporting and evaluation procedures?

f. Many different strategies are being considered now as a way of reducing the dropout rate. Do you think reducing the size of schools has any merit as a strategy?

What do you think is an ideal size for a (high or middle) school?

What obstacles keep you from reducing the size of your school if you think that smallness is an asset?

Do you think that creating mini schools in larger schools or blocking the classes of youngsters so that they have a closer relationship with a few teachers has merit?

What are the difficulties one would have to overcome to set up mini schools for at-risk youngsters in your school?

Do you think that it is important for schools to have a certain percentage of academically able youngsters, i.e. students who read on grade level and have good attendance to establish a climate for learning?

If yes, what would you say is the minimum percentage?

What should be done when schools do not have that percentage?

Do you think it is possible to reduce substantially the dropout rate in large schools by increasing social services for youngsters in those schools but not making major structural modifications in their size or organization?

What tells you that?

What do you think of dropout prevention strategies which emphasize reorganizing schools so that teachers have more opportunity to work together on curriculum matters and more time to spend in non-instructional activities with students like counselling?

B. Provide Background Information

1. Program Background

a. Did you have a AIDP program last year?

b. Is this year's program substantially the same as the one last year?

2. School Processes

a. How long have you been the principal of this school?

b. What are its strengths and weaknesses?

c. Is there any organizational feature in the school which enables teachers to work together on instructional matters regularly?

d. What help is available to teachers who need to improve their skills?

e. Is there an ongoing process for reviewing data about student progress and planning interventions based on this review? Describe it?

Who is involved?

f. What is the guidance counsellor/student ratio?

g. Is there any mechanism such as an advisory group for teachers to spend time with small groups of students in guidance-related activities?

h. How are students advised about course selection?

i. What help is available for students who need extra academic support?

j. Do you have any mini schools? How and for what purpose are they organized?

k. What health and social service agencies are involved on a regular basis with youngsters in the school--exclusive of your AIDP or DPP effort?

l. Do you have a program in your school which aims to get jobs for needy youngsters?

If yes, is it integrated with your dropout prevention efforts?

SCHOOL: _____

INVESTIGATOR: _____

RESPONDENT(S): _____

_____

INTERVIEW DATE: _____

Student Questionnaire
A. Demographics Information

1. Age?

2. Race?

3. Language spoken at home?

4. Years attending this school?

5. Credits accumulated?

6. Number of other high schools attended?

B. Program Implementation

7. Who is your _____? (Probe all program positions providing direct services to students.)

Position 1 _____

Position 2 _____

Position 3 _____

	Position #I	Position #II	Position #III
Date Started (8)			
Sessions Completed (9)			
Level of Contact (10)			
Follow Up (11)			
Activities (12)			
Satisfaction (13)			
Reason			

8. When did you start seeing _____?
(State each position/name and list p.2.)

9. How often have you seen _____ this year?
(State each position/name and list p.2.)

10. Do you see _____ every day, once a week, or when you feel it?
(State each position/name and list p.2.)

11. What happens if you don't show up as planned?
(State each position/name and list p.2.)

12. What kind of things do you talk about or do together?
(State each position/name and list p.2.)

13. Do you like it a lot, a little, or not at all?
Why?
(State each position/name and list on p.2.)

14. Has your attendance improved this year?

Yes (If yes, go to 15)
No (If no, go to 17)

15. Has anything about this program helped or/was it something else? Check any that apply.

_____ This program
_____ Something else

16. What specifically about _____ helped you come to school more often?

(Go to 18)

17. Why hasn't it improved?

18. Could this program be more helpful to you?

Yes (If yes, go to 19)
No (If no, go to 20)

19. How could it be more helpful?

20. What is the best thing about the program ?

21. What is the worst thing?

22. Overall, do you like this program, a lot, a little, or not at all?

23 Why?

24. Does being in the program present any special problems?

25. Do you like school more, less or about the same as last year?

If more or less, go to 26
If same, go to next section

26. What made it better (worse)?

C. Background

27. What is the best thing about the school?

28. What is the worst thing?

29. Does this affect your coming to school in any way?

30. How often does each of the following happen in your school? (this year)
(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely
a. students drop out	1	2	3
b. students do not attend school	1	2	3
c. students cut classes	1	2	3
d. students talk back to teachers	1	2	3
e. students refuse to obey rules	1	2	3
f. students get into fights wt @ other	1	2	3
g. students attack or threaten to attack teachers	1	2	3
h. students rob each other in school	1	2	3
i. students damage school property	1	2	3
j. students carry weapons	1	2	3
k. girls get pregnant	1	2	3
l. students use drugs or alcohol	1	2	3
m. drugs are sold in or around school	1	2	3
n. rape or attempted rape	1	2	3

31. Have you noticed any improvement this year in the following:

	Yes	No
a. student absenteeism	1	2
b. student cutting	1	2
c. student behavior	1	2

32. How would you rate the following aspects of the school:

	V Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good
a. safety coming to school	1	2	3	4	5
b. safety inside school	1	2	3	4	5
c. orderliness in halls	1	2	3	4	5
d. orderliness in classrooms	1	2	3	4	5
e. condition of building	1	2	3	4	5
f. princ/AP treatment of students	1	2	3	4	5
g. teacher interest in students	1	2	3	4	5
h. quality of teaching	1	2	3	4	5
i. guidance counselors interest in students	1	2	3	4	5
j. fairness of rules	1	2	3	4	5
k. enforcement of rules	1	2	3	4	5
l. racial understanding	1	2	3	4	5
m. student interest in learning	1	2	3	4	5
n. school spirit among students	1	2	3	4	5
o. number of student activities (clubs,etc.) to participate in	1	2	3	4	5
p. school reputation in community	1	2	3	4	5
q. your overall happiness with this school	1	2	3	4	5

D. Academic Program

33. Is the course work hard, easy, or just right for your?
CIRCLE THE ANSWER ABOVE.

34. How many hours of homework are you given each night?

35. Do your teachers do anything if you don't do your homework? Explain.

36. Do teachers want you to succeed?

37. Do they help you if you have problems?

38. Is there anyone else in school who can help you if you get behind?
Yes____ No_____
If yes, who_____
How often have you gone to this person this year_____

39. Are you encouraged to ask questions in class?

40. Are the courses varied enough to meet your needs?

41. Are there sufficient textbooks, that is, enough so that you can bring yours home every night to do your homework?

42. Is there anyone you can talk to if you need advice on classes or personal matters?

43. Do teachers generally, sometimes, or rarely have time to talk with you informally about things that are on your mind?

44. Are your parents always, sometimes or rarely interested in how you do in school?

E. Truancy Problem

45. Please check any factor which plays a role in your decisions to cut class or not attend school. CIRCLE THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR.

a. ____Prefer work to school
b. ____Not interested in "
c. ____School is too hard
d. ____Doing failing work
e. ____Dislike a teacher/s
f. ____Dislike a subject/s
g. ____Can learn more out of school
h. ____Need money to help at home
i. ____Dislike students
j. ____Need/want spending money
k. ____Problems with drugs/alcohol
l. ____Ill health
m. ____Friends not in school
n. ____Suspended
o. ____Marriage
p. ____Pregnancy
q. ____School too dangerous
r. ____Parents wanted me home
s. ____Do not know

46. How many times have you been absent this year_____?

47. How many times have you been late for class this year _____?

48. How often have you cut this year_____?

49. Does anyone at school contact you or your family when you are absent?
If yes, explain

50. Is this a change from last year?

51. Does anyone at school contact you or your family when you cut class?
If yes, explain

52. Is this a change from last year?

53. If attendance was followed up on in every class, for example, if your parents were notified if you cut a class, would you cut less?

54. How concerned are you about missing some days of school?
    Very Concerned____
    Somewhat Concerned____
    Not Concerned_____

55. Does missing school affect your grades?

56. What is the lowest grade you are satisfied with?

57. Is a diploma important in allowing you to do what you want to do later?

58. Do you expect to graduate from high school?

59. Did you do any work in the past semester, not counting work around the house, for pay?
    If yes, go to 60
    If no, go to 63

60. How many hours did you or do you usually work/week?

61. How did you get your job?

62. Do you like work better, the same, or less than school?
    CIRCLE ANSWER ABOVE

63. Are there any classes or other school activities you hate to miss? Explain.

64. Do you participate in any other clubs or student activities?
    LIST ALL BELOW.

SCHOOL: _____

INVESTIGATOR: _____

RESPONDENT (S): _____

_____

INTERVIEW DATE: _____

Faculty Questionnaire
A. Program Implementation

1. Job title in program?

2. What was your start date in the program?

3. How long have you been working at this school?

4. What are the major tasks that you are supposed to perform as (state job title)?

Task 1 _____
_____
_____

Task 2 _____
_____
_____

Task 3 _____
_____
_____

	Task #I	Task #II	Task #III
Date Task Started (5)			
Number Students Now Served (6)			
Numbers Intended To Serve (7)			
Hours/Week on Task (9)			
How Referred (10)			
Level of Contact (11)			
Follow Up (12)			
Satisfaction (13)			
Reason (13)			

5. When did you begin carrying out this task?
(State each task and list p.2).

6. How many students are you working with presently?
(State each task and list p.2).

7. How many students will you be working with when you are doing this at the level that was originally intended?
(State each task and list p.2, if number larger than that in 6, go to 8).

8. What have been the problems in getting the number of students intended?

9. How many hours/weeks do you spend on this task?
(State each task and list p.2).

10. How were these students referred to you?
(State each task and p.2.)

11. How often do you have contact with most of these students: Weekly, daily: as frequently or infrequently as they choose?
(State each task and list p.2.)

12. What happens if they don't show up?
(State each task and list p.2.)

13. On a scale of 1 to 5, when 1 is not satisfied and 5 is very satisfied, how would you rate your satisfaction with this task? What accounts for this?
(State each task and list p.2.)

14. Are there any other tasks that you are supposed to do that you have not begun to carry out as yet?

Yes (If yes, list tasks and go to 15)

_____

_____

_____

No (If no, go to 16)

15. What prevented you from doing this?

16. What percentage of the students you work with are ESL students?

(If 0% go to 20).

17. How do you handle language difficulties, if any?

18. Do you feel that this is adequate?

Yes (If yes, go to 15)
No (If no, go to 14)

19. What do you feel is needed to deal with the problem effectively?

20. What percentage of the students you work with are Special Education students?

(If 0% go to 24)

21. How do you handle problems, if any, in dealing with these particular students?

22. Do you feel that this is adequate?

Yes (If yes, go to 22)
No (If no, go to 23)

23. What is needed to deal with this more effectively?

24. Are there needy students who do not receive AIDP/DPP services?

Yes (If yes, go to 25)
No (If no, to to 26)

25. Tell me about these students?

26. Are there some targeted students for whom the program does not work?

Yes (If yes, go to 27)
No (If no, go to 28)

27. Would you characterize these students please?

28. In your opinion what have been the most difficult parts of the school program to put into effect?

29. Please explain why there was a problem with this (these) part (s) of the program?

30. How would you characterize the attitudes of staff involved in non-AIDP/DPP dropout/attendance activities, like PREP toward AIDP/DPP?

    (If positive only, go to 32)

31. Has this hindered AIDP/DPP in any way?

32. What are the attitudes of the rest of the school staff toward this AIDP/DPP program?

33. Has this hindered AIDP/DPP in any way?

34. What could be done within the confines of the existing program to make it work better?

35. (If CBO component present) do you feel the involvement of the CBO has been helpful (or will be helpful) to the overall school effort?

36. Could you explain why?

37. What aspects of the school program do you think are the most effective?

38. Would you explain why you think these aspects are the most effective?

39. What aspects of the program do you think are the least worth-while?

40. Would you explain why you think these aspects are the least useful?

41. What could be done within the confines of the existing program to make it work better?

42. If you could create whatever kind of drop-out/attendance improvement program you wanted, what would it include that this program does not?

B. Background

1. What are the school's strengths?

2. What are the school's weaknesses?

3. How do these weaknesses affect the dropout prevention effort?

4. What could be done to eliminate these problems?

5. What are the principal's strengths?

6. What are the principal's weaknesses?

7. To what degree is each of these matters a problem in your school? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

	Serious	Moderate	Minor	Not At All
a. student attrition	1	2	3	4
b. student absenteeism	1	2	3	4
c. student cutting	1	2	3	4
d. physical conflicts among students	1	2	3	4
e. conflicts between students & teachers	1	2	3	4
f. robbery or theft	1	2	3	4
g. vandalism	1	2	3	4
h. drug or alcohol abuse	1	2	3	4
i. rape or attempted rape	1	2	3	4
j. possession of weapons	1	2	3	4
k. verbal abuse of teachers	1	2	3	4

8. Has there been any improvement since the AIDP/DPP program in the following:

	At Present		In Future	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. student attrition	1	2	1	2
b. student absenteeism	1	2	1	2
c. student cutting	1	2	1	2

9. Do you believe there may be improvements in the near future? (State answer in item 8)

10. How would you rate the following aspects of the school:

	V Poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very Good
a. safety coming to school	1	2	3	4	5
b. safety inside school	1	2	3	4	5
c. orderliness in halls	1	2	3	4	5
d. orderliness in classrooms	1	2	3	4	5
e. condition of building	1	2	3	4	5
f. principal/instructional leader	1	2	3	4	5
g. principal/administrator	1	2	3	4	5
h. communication between teachers and administrators	1	2	3	4	5
i. teacher' interest in students	1	2	3	4	5
j. teachers' expectations for student achievement	1	2	3	4	5
k. hours of homework assigned/night	1	2	3	4	5
l. quality of teaching	1	2	3	4	5
m. relationship among teachers	1	2	3	4	5
n. acad. support for students who get behind	1	2	3	4	5
o. guidance counselors interest in students	1	2	3	4	5
p. enforcement of rules	1	2	3	4	5
q. racial understanding	1	2	3	4	5

r. time for teachers to plan curriculum cooperatively	1	2	3	4	5
s. time for teachers to work with students informally or on non-instructional matters	1	2	3	4	5
t. quality of staff development activities	1	2	3	4	5
u. adequate numbers of appropriate texts/students	1	2	3	4	5
v. student interest in learning	1	2	3	4	5
w. school spirit among students	1	2	3	4	5
x. number variety of student activities	1	2	3	4	5
y. parents' interest in student progress	1	2	3	4	5
z. parents' support for school	1	2	3	4	5
aa. school's effort to involve parents	1	2	3	4	5
bb. school's reputation in community	1	2	3	4	5
cc. Bd.of Ed. support for school	1	2	3	4	5
dd. Your overall satisfaction with school	1	2	3	4	5